SSOAR

Open Access Repository
www.ssoar.info

Immigrant Effect and Collective Entrepreneurship: The Creation and Development of a Turkish Entrepreneurial Group

Elo, Maria

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:
GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:
Elo, M. (2019). Immigrant Effect and Collective Entrepreneurship: The Creation and Development of a Turkish Entrepreneurial Group. *Historical Social Research*, *44*(4), 129-161. https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.129-161

Nutzungsbedingungen:
Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de

Terms of use:
This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more Information see:
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Mitglied der
Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

Immigrant Effect and Collective Entrepreneurship - The Creation and Development of a Turkish Entrepreneurial Group

Maria Elo *

Abstract: *»Migrationseffekte und kollektives Unternehmertum – Die Entstehung und Entwicklung einer türkischen unternehmerischen Gruppe«.* This study addresses multifaceted business development via collective entrepreneurship in a return migration setting. Instead of focusing on the necessity lens on how migrants adapt economically and develop livelihoods, this study addresses migrant success and the outcome of migratory paths and learnings in entrepreneurial strategy. This single case study examines a Turkish migrant family in Germany and, in particular, the second-generation returnee to Turkey, and his venturing and resulting entrepreneurial and business groups. Returnees are known to invest in housing and local venturing, if they do not return as pensioners, but very little is known about the business strategies that transnational migrants introduce in the 'home' context and their success factors, even less on adolescent returnees' development. Thus, this study examines the interconnection of the migrantness, the entrepreneurial development, and the transfer of knowledge and ideas (i.e., immigrant effect) in business growth. It contributes to the research literature on returnees and transnational diaspora and, in particular, extends our understanding on the immigrant effect on collaboration and alliance building.

Keywords: Transnational diaspora entrepreneurship, returnee, immigrant effect, entrepreneurial group, business group, strategy, automotive aftermarket, Turkey.

1. Introduction

Migration is often approached from its problematic angle, as a result, migrant entrepreneurs are addressed in the category of necessity entrepreneurs (Chrysostome 2010). Further, entrepreneurship is seen as a coping strategy for economic adaptation and as a solution for livelihood generation (Portes, Guarnizo,

* Maria Elo, Department of Marketing & Management, University of Southern Denmark, Campusvej 55, 5230 Odense M, Denmark; also Belt and Road Institute of International Business, School of Economics, Shanghai University, 99 Shangda Road, BoaShan District, Shanghai, China and Turku School of Economics, University of Turku, 20014 Turun yliopisto, Turku, Finland; melo@sam.sdu.dk.

Historical Social Research 44 (2019) 4, 129-161 | published by GESIS
DOI: 10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.129-161

and Haller 2002; Guarnizo, Portes, and Haller 2003; Portes 2006). Such underlying assumptions denote that entrepreneurship is an outcome of migration, a post-migration phenomenon partly rooted in the migratory transformation. This is one form of emerging entrepreneurship of migrants, but there are also those who search, identify, and migrate for opportunities and business development (Ardichvili et al. 2003; Sarason, Dean, and Dillard 2006; Elo, Harima, and Freiling 2015; Elo and Volovelsky 2017), and those who seek them after returning (Bai, Holmström, and Johanson 2018; Liu et al. 2010).

There are many different contextual settings for the development of migrants' entrepreneurship and such settings influence their opportunity structures (Elo 2016a). The historical migration waves of labour diasporas after World War II, the "Gastarbeiter" (Bhagwati, Schatz, and Wong 1984; Klekowski von Koppenfels and Höhne 2017) provided an example of labour migrants for whom employment was the organizing element in terms of integration (Castles 2010). In fact, it was not expected that the Gastarbeiter would settle down in Germany, as they were seen as visiting labourers. Despite that and the low integrative expectations from the society as a whole, several spouses and family members started arriving afterwards and new families were emerging in diaspora. These categories of migrants were not targeted by policymaking as potential entrepreneurs at the time, although entrepreneurial activities are strongly intertwined with migration (Zolin and Schlosser 2013; Urbano, Toledano, and Ribeiro-Soriano 2011). Since then, ethnic enclaves and respective ethnic and transnational business formations of migrants have gained increasing attention (cf. Portes 2006). Interestingly, views addressing necessity, employment problems, and other deficits tend to dominate the research lenses.

In addition to labour migration, there are entrepreneurial migrants for whom entrepreneurial motivation exists a priori to their migration and functions as a push factor. Furthermore, entrepreneurial motivation influences pre-migratory and post-migratory building on opportunities and potential (Elo 2016b). It is to be noted that migrants may shift their status across categories, from employment to self-employment, entrepreneurship, and investment over time and generations (Masurel et al. 2002; Nijkamp, Sahin, and Baycan-levent 2010). Such entrepreneurial push is in the nexus of opportunity and agency (Sarason, Dean, and Dillard 2006) and constitutes an idiosyncratic force. Returnees, particularly transnational diaspora returnees who establish entrepreneurial activities in their country of origin, are approached more often from the opportunity perspective and are subject to higher expectations on their contribution after returning (Liu et al. 2010; Drori, Honig, and Wright 2009). Repatriation is a process that brings in the human capital built abroad and thus its meaning for entrepreneurial orientation, competences, and knowledge can be notable (Reiche 2012; McCormick and Wahba 2001). However, if the repatriation happens before the individual has obtained a professional life and respective assets, for example, as an adolescent or student, the market knowledge, social

ties, and networks are not necessarily there (Pruthi 2014; Bai, Holmström, and Johanson 2018) and instead of competitive advantages the person faces new socio-cultural and other disadvantages in the new context (Sahin 1990). This is often the case for so-called 1.5 generation migrants who are children or adolescents following their parents.

Currently, extant entrepreneurship research has concentrated on issues, such as categories of migrants as immigrants, ethnic, diaspora, and transnational entrepreneurs in different contexts and has invested fewer efforts in understanding their mobility, international business strategies, and collective dimensions (Riddle and Brinkerhoff 2011). Migrant embeddedness socially (e.g., family, co-ethnic teams, diaspora) and culturally (e.g., linguistics, religion, traditions) emerges as a crucial contextual setting for such analysis (e.g., Jones et al. 2014; Elo and Minto-Coy 2018). Migration research focuses on more aggregated levels, such as in and out-flows of migrants and the pull and push forces shaping these outcomes. However, relatively little research is carried out on the individual entrepreneur level explaining the micro foundations of entrepreneurial migratory paths and the reasons behind it. The entry-exit decisions and dynamics remain often underexplored and there is yet very little research on the formation and employment of migrants' resources related to their migratory transformations (Elo and Leinonen 2018). Moreover, the reflection of how entrepreneurs recruit partners for their ventures or strike business alliances is largely unexplored (Ruef 2010) as is the interplay of strategies how entrepreneurial ventures proceed once established in different contexts and opportunity settings (see also Etemad 2004, 2018). Understanding the strategy potential brought in by migrant and diaspora entrepreneurs can provide interesting implications for theory, management, and policymaking but it also requires more careful contextualisation (Riddle, Hrivnak, and Nielsen 2010; Welter 2011; Zahra, Wright, and Abdelgawad 2014).

Despite their business environment and contextual impediments, migrants are particularly entrepreneurial and entrepreneurially oriented (Etemad 2015; Blume-Kohout 2016). In fact, migrants who are entrepreneurs can benefit from family, social and ethnic resources, and "safety" networks that may alleviate impediments (Ma et al. 2013; Chen and Tan 2009; Sørensen and Vammen 2014). Extant research indicates that entrepreneurial migrants form teams and groups, which enables business generation and growth (Cooney 2005; Kakarika 2013; Discua Cruz, Hamilton, and Jack 2012; Discua Cruz, Howorth, and Hamilton 2013). There is rich literature on social groups, networks, and communities that influence entrepreneurial activity through embeddedness and interconnectedness, but also through cultural dimensions of collectivism and interdependencies and shared agendas (Ruef 2010; Price and Chacko 2009; T. Jones et al. 2014; Kloosterman 2010; Rath and Kloosterman 2000; Castles 2010; Tharenou 2010; Bengtsson and Kock 2000; Johnson, Dowd, and Ridgeway 2006). The social relationships and ties of migrants have linguistic, reli-

gious, social, ethnic, and cultural dimensions in their ties that others do not have (Pruthi 2014; Waldinger and Duquette-rury 2015; van Dalen, Groenewold, and Fokkema 2005; Elo and Volovelsky 2017; Sørensen and Vammen 2014; Ibeh and Kasem 2011; Discua Cruz, Howorth, and Hamilton 2013). The way how migrants engage their social ties in business operations is possibly context-specific, not only geographically, but also temporally and market-wise (Dimitratos et al. 2016; Ram, Theodorakopoulos, and Jones 2008).

The purpose of this study is to intersect migrant entrepreneurship theories with collective entrepreneurial strategies on business groups and networks by addressing the connected and collective nature of business development. This study moves beyond the ontological dichotomy between individual and firm-level analysis and examines not the social formations of entrepreneurial groups or the inherent teams per se, but the formation of an entrepreneurial group, its business relationships, and growing network dimension to a global group.

This study asks how an entrepreneur with a migratory background, particularly a 1.5-2. generation "returnee", establishes collaborations and builds alliances – both in the sense of individual collaborations in an *entrepreneurial group* (see Harper 2008, Ruef 2010; see also Kontos 2003, Vissa and Chacar 2009) and inter-organizational alliances in *business groups* (Khanna and Palepu 1999; Iacobucci and Rosa 2005; Karaevli and Yurtoglu 2017; Lechner and Leyronas 2009). The focal interests are on understanding the capability of migrant entrepreneurs to transfer their knowledge from one market to another while shifting contexts and how they develop entrepreneurial growth strategies using their *immigrant effect* (Chung, Rose, and Huang 2012) for novel entrepreneurial collaboration and growth. In other contexts, business groups run and owned by ethnic and migrant groups have employed their immigrant effect strategically for internationalization and international expansion (cf. Yeung 1999; Sui, Morgan, and Baum 2015). Still, the evolution of such process remains underexplored. As the theme requires in-depth understanding, a qualitative approach is suitable and a single case study is applied. The case study covers the migratory path of an individual entrepreneur, Mr. Kavkaci, between Turkey and Germany, from childhood and family firms to the establishment of his first venture, REKSIM, and the strategic expansion into a Turkish business group TATCOM (an alliance of entrepreneurial groups) being a central actor in the Turkish market and, finally, into a member of an international business network TEMOT INTERNATIONAL (a global alliance). The case illustrates the importance of immigrant effect and entrepreneurial orientation within the family, local adaptation, understanding embeddedness and social relationships, and collective investments in long-term development. In particular, the transfer of contacts, contextual understanding, and business approaches originating from other contexts employed successfully to benefit the business venturing in a larger constellation is an interesting and unusual outcome.

The study contributes to: a) understanding the complex intertwinement of entrepreneurial and business group formation as business networks, b) advancing diaspora and transnational migrant entrepreneurship studies theoretically, and c) exploring the immigrant effect in entrepreneurial strategy and collective entrepreneurship.

The paper is organized as follows: first, extant theories on migrant entrepreneurship are discussed and then the research approach is introduced. In the following part, the case study is presented and findings are explained. Finally, the implications and future research are discussed in the conclusion.

2. Theories Explaining Migrant Entrepreneurship and Transnationalism – A Review

Entrepreneurship research has long debated the question of who the entrepreneur is and respective entrepreneurial opportunity development (Shane and Venkataraman 2007; Gartner 1989). Shane and Venkataraman (2000, 218) link the opportunity with the emerging entrepreneurship (i.e., establishment of the firm or respective activity). Moreover, they specify two key elements to study: the *processes* of discovery, evolution, and exploitation of opportunities; and the *set of individuals* who discover, evaluate, and exploit (ibid.). Entrepreneurship research can therefore be understood as explaining the discovery and development of opportunities (Ardichvili et al. 2003). The literature on "just" entrepreneurship (without the descriptive adjective) does not specify the origin or ethnicity of the entrepreneur. In different streams of entrepreneurship research, the focus of analysis differs, for instance, from the individual, team, or family to the firm. The positions of the different theoretical viewpoints are not explicit and they often overlap regarding the entrepreneur-person generating analytical confusion. Therefore, a review to the extant research is needed to foster the understanding on analysis.

There is another on-going discussion on the ontological and epistemological roots in entrepreneurship, especially concerning migrant and international entrepreneurship and these concerns relate strongly to the focus of analysis and contest the traditions in terms of the object of study (cf. Elo et al. 2018; Etemad 2018). The object of analysis building on the dichotomist firm-individual focus – inherent in various forms of migrant and international entrepreneurship due to the categorization – tends to bring a research bias with it by leaving the context (Welter 2011; Zahra, Wright, and Abdelgawad 2014), the embeddedness in respective contexts (Granovetter 1985; Price and Chacko 2009; Halinen and Törnroos 1998), and the dynamics of context (Rana and Elo 2017; Zahra 2008) with less attention. It is theoretically relevant that focal entrepreneurs or focal firms do not operate in a vacuum (Chang, Chiang, and Pai 2012; Halinen and Törnroos 2005), although for immigrant entrepreneurs certain

vacuum-like constellations may prevail (Rath and Kloosterman 2000). But regardless of such societal in- and out-groups and respective discrimination (Santamaria-Alvarez et al. 2018), entrepreneurs are rarely acting alone in their actual venturing, as they are supported by family members and friends and often co-venture with others, forming various entrepreneurial teams and groups that bring together missing resources formally or informally (e.g., Kontos 2003; Vissa and Chacar 2009).

International entrepreneurship (IE) research focuses more on the firm than addressing the origin of the entrepreneur. International entrepreneurship is seen as the development of international new ventures or start-ups that, from their inception, engage in international business, thus viewing their operating domain as international from the initial stages of the firm's operations (Oviatt and McDougall 2005). IE addresses "the discovery, enactment, evaluation, and exploitation of opportunities – across national borders – to create future goods and services" (Oviatt and McDougall 2005, 540). There are different conceptualizations of international opportunities: some address international opportunities in particular (innovation opportunities and arbitrage opportunities), others refer more to the entrepreneurs' behaviour and enactment on opportunities (Opportunity discovery and Opportunity creation) (Mainela, Puhakka, and Servais 2014).

Ethnic economies and ethnic entrepreneurship theories started focusing on the ethnicity in entrepreneurship by employing the lens of minority within a host country setting, very often with a sociological, ethnological, or psychological emphasis (e.g., Basu 2009; Chaganti and Greene 2002; Dana and Dana 2008; Price and Chacko 2009). Ethnic entrepreneurship addresses ethnic minority entrepreneurship, setting a contextual "indigenous vs. entrant" comparison and underlining the status in the overall societal context (e.g., Basu 2009; Dana 2007; Ilhan-Nas, Sahin, and Cilingir 2011; Ram and Jones 2008). The ethnicity and ethnic character of the entrepreneur has been central in the explanandum of this stream, but also aspects of social and human capital, theories on assimilation and institutions, and even theology have been employed (Ram, Theodorakopoulos, and Jones 2008; Guarnizo, Portes, and Haller 2003; Riddle and Brinkerhoff 2011). Even the entrepreneurial traits of certain ethnic populations are debated (cf. Cohen, 2008).

Ethnic populations are a central setting in these lenses. Waldinger, Aldrich, and Ward (1990, 3) define ethnic entrepreneurship as "a set of connections and regular patterns of interaction among people sharing common national background or migration experiences "(Waldinger, Aldrich, and Ward 1990). Ethnic entrepreneurs have particular motivations and work under different performance conditions than domestic entrepreneurs, despite the deficit lens on economic adaption, there are novel views on urban endogenous growth among groups with a distinct cultural identity (Masurel et al. 2002). Zhou (2004) notes

that ethnic entrepreneurship research excludes larger firms and differs through operating in ethnic businesses and out of mainstream economy.

Immigrant entrepreneurship theory refers to those entrepreneur-individuals who have actually immigrated over the past few decades pointing out the meaning of their migratory path (Volery 2007). The concept of immigrant entrepreneurship (Aliaga-Isla and Rialp 2013) addresses individuals who have recently arrived in a host country and then start a business as a means of economic survival (Chaganti and Greene 2002). Ethnic enclave theory and middleman theory are linked to ethnic entrepreneurship theory (Volery 2007; Terjesen and Elam 2009); in ethnic enclaves (i.e., geographical locations with ethnic populations), ethnic entrepreneurs develop intra-ethnic businesses while middleman (also referred to as middleman minority) represents a category of ethnic intermediaries who connect producers and consumers or span boundaries in trade relations (cf. Cohen, 2008). These concepts and notions are often linked with nuances of discrimination, victim diasporas, and lower societal status.

The debates on terms and definitions are on-going and fuzzy, the personal status of migrant origin people differ and their social and business lives may be related to an isolated niche (Masurel et al. 2002; Ma et al. 2013). In terms of international expansion, ethnic enterprises are local, settled companies following ethnic strategies, i.e., they are not active in internationalization; they perceive and act on opportunities affected by their entrepreneurship dimension, but also by their ethnical, cultural, and religious background (Volery 2007). Another crucial point is the way opportunities are approached and created, as there are also opportunity-driven "business immigrant" cases (Clydesdale 2008; Elo, Harima, and Freiling 2015; Elo and Hieta 2017), not just necessity driven migrants (Chrysostome 2010; Newland and Tanaka 2010), and their survival strategies differ (Harima, Elo, and Freiling 2016; Elo 2016b/c).

Furthermore, generations of migrants differ in their entrepreneurship (Discua Cruz, Hamilton, and Jack 2012; Achidi Ndofor and Priem 2011). There is a difference in the venture type between first and second generation immigrants, indeed, more technology and knowledge oriented ventures of second generation immigrants are also more affine for international activities than locally oriented service firms (Beckers and Blumberg 2013).

The transnationalism of migrants and migrant entrepreneurs represents a significant potential for entrepreneurship but it is also considered that transnationalism may decrease over time and due to assimilation (Guarnizo, Portes, and Haller 2003; Elo and Hieta 2017). Transnational entrepreneurship (TE) forms a lens to compare international entrepreneurs, ethnic entrepreneurs, and returnee entrepreneurs while addressing issues such as why, how, and when individuals or organizations pursue new ventures employing resources in more than one country (Drori, Honig, and Wright 2009; Drori, Honig and Ginsberg 2010). TE builds on understanding the *process* of TE that involves entrepre-

neurial activities that are carried out in a cross-national context, and initiated by actors who are embedded in at least two different social and economic arenas. Transnational entrepreneurs – the term refers to individuals migrating from one country to another, concurrently maintaining business-related linkages with their former country of origin, and currently adopted countries and communities, but also approaches them as social actors who enact networks, ideas, information, and practices, especially with the purpose to address business opportunities or maintaining businesses (Drori, Honig, and Wright 2009); thus, there is a *dual social fields* setting. This theory lens incorporates the migration aspect and also refers to diaspora but is not focusing on similar dimensions with these research streams; instead, it leans heavily on the concept of transnationalism (Vertovec 2001). The level of analysis builds on the firm and the entrepreneur, and examines respective attributes and activities (Sequeira, Carr, and Rasheed 2009). Inherently, the theoretical interest is concentrating on the international nature of the venture and its international activities (Terjesen and Elam 2009), but also on its embedded nature and networks (Chen and Tan 2009), such as the social context and habitus of the transnational entrepreneur (e.g., Patel and Conklin 2009; Ambrosini 2012).

Transnationalism as the guiding characteristic of venturing and entrepreneurial development is a complex concept (cf. Levitt 2001; Vertovec 2001, see also Elo and Freiling 2015). Kivisto (2001, 549) criticizes transnationalism as a concept that "suffers from ambiguity as a result of competing definitions that fail to specify the temporal and spatial parameters of the term and to adequately locate it vis-á-vis older concepts such as assimilation and cultural pluralism". Transnationalism as a concept originates in humanistic sciences – not in entrepreneurship – and its evolutionary nature is intrinsic and individual. Thus, there are two dynamic processes co-evolving but the causalities linking these two phenomena (transnationalism and entrepreneurship) and their levels (individual vs. organization) are still underexplored. Elo and Jokela (2015) found that there are individuals who are transnational and entrepreneurs, but who do not represent transnational entrepreneurs, i.e., are not having international business activities building on their transnationalism in cross-border context. In addition, they indicate that the degree of transnationalism reduced over time as the first generation entrepreneurs became more and more integrated in the country of residence (Elo and Jokela 2015).

Diaspora entrepreneurship theory associates the migrant resources into a multi-layered socio-cultural and country setting (Riddle and Brinkerhoff 2011; Brinkerhoff 2016). Transnational diaspora entrepreneurs refers to migrants and their descendants who set-up entrepreneurial activities spanning the national business environments of their countries of origin and countries of residence (Riddle, Hrivnak, and Nielsen 2010). Diaspora entrepreneurship has diverse contextual settings; nine different country-settings for analysis have been identified acknowledging the particularities of emerging and developing markets

(Elo 2016b). That being said, diaspora entrepreneurs are not just bound to one place, as diasporans per definition are migrants who settle in some places, move on, and regroup; they may also be dispersed; and they are in a continuous state of formation and reformation (Cohen, 2008, 142).

Diaspora entrepreneurs can be transnational and international in their activities and lifestyle (Riddle and Brinkerhoff 2011); nevertheless, some transnational diasporans employ their entrepreneurial resources more in the context of one country (Elo and Jokela 2015). Circular diasporans are circulating between countries, even without permanent return or residence, connecting markets and developing businesses transnationally (Riddle, Hrivnak, and Nielsen 2010). Interestingly, diasporic motivations, resources and strategies to venture in the host country may significantly differ from those in the home country, as in many contexts altruistic, sentimental, and social aspects seem to influence their behaviour towards their homeland (Newland and Tanaka 2010; Gillespie et al. 1999; Riddle, Hrivnak, and Nielsen 2010).

Therefore, diasporas as both locally and internationally relevant actors for economy form talent pools for economic development and innovation (Kuznetsov 2006a; Elo and Vemuri 2016; Kumar, Mudambi, and Gray 2013). According to Kuznetsov (2006b, 221), diaspora networks have three key features that may support their entrepreneurship: 1) networks bring together people with strong intrinsic motivation; 2) members of diaspora play both direct roles (implementing projects in the country of origin) and indirect roles (serving as bridges and antennae for the country of origin project development); and 3) successful initiatives move from discussions on how to get involved with the country of origin to transactions (tangible outcomes, such as entrepreneurial activities and investments) (Kuznetsov 2006a). The research streams addressing ethnic groups and diaspora communities acknowledge the embeddedness of the individual in a larger context; however, the location and spread of this social context may differ.

Particular types of diasporic people are the *returnees*, the ones who permanently repatriate to their country of origin. The category of returnee entrepreneurship has been most central in the context of Asia and the economic development of China and India, but also elsewhere with previous outflows of migrants (Pruthi 2014; Liu et al. 2010; McCormick and Wahba 2001). This theoretical lens refers to entrepreneurs who have first migrated and then repatriated bringing new technology, knowledge, and other capabilities to their ventures in the country of origin (e.g., Kuznetsov 2006a, 2006b; Kenney, Brenitz, and Murphee 2013). The context of emerging economies has been very central as the framework for this research stream (e.g., Bruton, Ahlstrom, and Obloj 2008; Liu et al. 2010). For example, Filatotchev et al. (2009) link exporting of high-technology small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) with knowledge transfer of returnee entrepreneurs (see more in Liu et al. 2010). In the context of Egypt as the country of origin, the connection of the return and

the resulting entrepreneurship is positively influenced by work experience abroad and the duration of stay overseas in terms of literate returnees, showing that the acquired skills matter most, while for illiterate returnees the generated savings were more significant in fostering resulting entrepreneurship as they had less opportunity to learn respective skills (McCormick and Wahba 2001). Wang and Liu (2016) address the returnee entrepreneurial talent and its management and present several resulting entrepreneurial ecosystems.

Ammassari (2004) found that, in particular, elite return migrants benefit their countries of origin through economic activity such as entrepreneurship and investment. Moreover, they contribute with innovative practices, productive investments, ideas, knowledge, work skills, and foreign experience, like in the case of Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire (Ammassari 2004). However, there were slight differences in the entrepreneurial behaviour of these two cohorts indicating that diasporas are heterogeneous and idiographic in their contexts. Entrepreneurial differences may also originate in the contextual setting, such as the country constellation influencing the resource base, the social and professional embeddedness, and the entrepreneurial strategy (cf. Brinkerhoff 2009).

Although there is a strong notion of family, clan, co-ethnics, and diaspora communities- at least through the concept of embeddedness- in migrant and diaspora entrepreneurship research, this collectiveness in action has not been widely addressed in the analysis (Price and Chacko 2009; Jones et al. 2014). Aggregations of entrepreneurial action such as entrepreneurial business groups, networks, and strategic alliances are less researched in the context of transnational and diaspora entrepreneurship (Child, Faulkner, and Tallman 2011; Discua Cruz, Hamilton, and Jack 2012). However, industrial business networks, international business and marketing related networks offer suitable conceptual and analytical lenses to also address formations of migrants' strategic business groups (Halinen, Törnroos, and Elo 2013; Vasilchenko and Morrish 2011). Network theories assist in exploring migrant entrepreneurship collective activities (cf. Ford, 2002). Ontologically suitable network approaches can be valuable in related contexts representing entrepreneurial and inter-organizational relationships and networks (e.g., Ford 2002; Sydow et al. 2010; Larimo et al. 2015) such as entrepreneurial groups, business groups and alliances where migrants enact business opportunities.

As transnational diasporas are multi-local, multi-layered networks and social formations, their entrepreneurial group and business group dimensions deserve theoretical attention following these structural leads of theoretical interest. Beyond the sociological and anthropological lens of entrepreneurial business actors and their collective action, there is another stream of research on the groups as interconnected businesses, where formations of firms represent the actors (Khanna and Palepu 1999; Iacobucci and Rosa 2005; Karaevli and Yurtoglu 2017; Lechner and Leyronas 2009). The difference between the people and the organizational level is not clear-cut because smaller firms may de facto

represent a single entrepreneur. Thus, the locus of agency theoretically differs in these viewpoints. Since businesses established by migrants differ in terms of their resources from other businesses, the business groups that evolve and grow as a result of migrant entrepreneur's action and strategy require more research (Sui, Morgan, and Baum 2015; Alam et al. 2010; Committee et al. 2010; Drori, Honig, and Wright 2009).

Iacobucci and Rosa (2005) suggest that entrepreneurial firms grow through the formation of business groups that represent a set of companies run by the same entrepreneur or entrepreneurial team. Another view on business groups addresses them as aggregation of small (independent) businesses, i.e., multi-entrepreneurial formations (Lechner and Leyronas 2009; Merchant 2001). The East Asian business groups that are often family and clan- based (i.e., family groups) are known for their particular business group structures and networks forming both a resource base and structural inertia (cf. Guillen, 2000), but also for regional expansion and growth. Those networks and alliances that build on intercultural interaction among the business group involve higher complexity and require particular intercultural competences (Larimo et al. 2015).

Sociological viewpoints have addressed social structures, collectivity, and relationships in entrepreneurial groups (Ruef 2010). In a similar vein, business networks of entrepreneurial firms are reflected as actors accessing and employing resources of network partners through the ties and bonds created (Halinen and Törnroos 1998; Basu and Virick 2015; Bengtsson and Kock 2000; Pruthi 2014; Coviello 2006). The nodes may also represent individual entrepreneurs whose ties connect the network (e.g., Ford 2002). Business network theory has concentrated on the interplay of the entrepreneur-firm and the business formations (e.g., groups, nets, and networks) employing an analytical lens of actor's activities, resource structures, and interaction patterns (Håkansson et al., 2009). This theory focuses on networks as "*sets of connected business relationships rather than as sets of connected firms*" (Anderson et al. 2002, 229) and offers suitable analytical framings for understanding transnational diaspora entrepreneurship and respective business activity formations. As Hansen (1995) points out, entrepreneurial networks are very similar to business networks, since both focus on the organizational growth and development.

Theoretically, the study of transnational business networking and venturing of migrants and their entrepreneurial and business groups is either fragmented due to disciplinary silos or under-developed offering little insights on the mechanisms because the long term perspectives are lacking (Drori, Honig, and Wright 2009; Elo et al. 2018).

3. Research Approach and Methods

The study has an explorative strategy based on qualitative approach using a single case study (Piekkari, Plakoyiannaki, and Welch 2010; Eisenhardt 1989; Marschan-Piekkari and Welch 2004). A single case study is considered appropriate as this study examines a complex real-life phenomenon and presents ethnographic dimensions (Carsrud and Brännback 2014). This design builds on the relation of the entrepreneur-migrant and entrepreneurial strategy and its application process in the expansion of the firm into a global group using a network approach. The analytical logic reflects extant views on different migrant entrepreneurship forms and expands the theory discussion (Eisenhardt 1989). It is designed as a chronological analysis of the development of the entrepreneurial path from a single venture to a network with an additional lens on the migration processes. In parallel, critical events linking entrepreneurship and venturing[1], strategy and alliance building are identified and analysed in terms of contents and meanings (Halinen, Törnroos, and Elo 2013). The interplay of the events and resulting changes represent the causality between the constructs (cf. immigrant effect).

The case selection is purposeful as the case represents a critical case on transnational diaspora entrepreneurship (Aharoni 2011) and thus functions as a theory validating and testing empirical material that extends our understanding on what transnational diaspora entrepreneurship is and represents (Gaur and Kumar 2010). The case is identified from a data bank on internationally active companies in the automotive sector and through personal discussions on criteria such as family background, origin, nationality, type of business, and business strategy. The data collection is qualitative. The primary data consists of diverse types of qualitative data, such as in-depth interviews with the entrepreneur and his family, other individual interviews, group discussions with the family, and follow-up questions per email (Marschan-Piekkari and Welch 2004). The focal actor is the entrepreneur, who is the firm's founder and as the embedded context his family and partners are involved in group discussions and interviews of stakeholders (cf. Ford 2002; Carsrud and Brännback 2014). Most discussions and observations were conducted by two researchers to support the quality of the interpretation and the social interaction (Yin 2013; Silverman 1998). Further data collection includes ethnographic visiting, participation, and observations as well as field notes and photographic material that build an overall understanding of the process (Johnstone 2007; Silverman 2006; Marschan-Piekkari and Welch 2004). In addition to primary data, secondary data has been collected from company documents, news,

[1] Venturing here refers to the establishment of business that involves other individuals as investors/co-entrepreneurs, not just one single entrepreneur.

internet, and other print and marketing material and triangulated (Heath 2015; Denzin 2012). The ethnographic-style participant researcher data collection allows for field notes and observations that serve for naturally occurring data between 2015-2017 (Bruni, Gherardi, and Poggio 2004; Johnstone 2007).

As the study aims to contribute by theorizing migrant entrepreneurship and strategy, it follows the analytical tradition by addressing the focal actor that is not the firm but the entrepreneur-establisher as a person, referred in analysis as 'the entrepreneur'. It is noteworthy that the context and the type of entrepreneurial activity in its multiple embeddedness and complexity require methodological attention to provide contributions for theorizing (Welter 2011; Wiklund et al. 2011). Therefore, in terms of analytical logic, it is important to address the different layers of embeddedness; social, cultural, contextual, migratory, and business layers in addition to the entrepreneur when analysing the entrepreneurial and business group formations (Landolt 2001). In particular, as the business evolves within the family setting, its family constellations play a role as well (Discua Cruz, Hamilton, and Jack 2012; Discua Cruz, Howorth, and Hamilton 2013; Basco and Pérez Rodríguez 2011). The data is analysed using progressive logic which suggests going back and forth between empirical data and theories, through which the analysis evolves and is then framed chronologically in its context and logically as an explorative case study (Jones and Coviello 2005; Halinen, Törnroos, and Elo 2013; Sinkovics and Alfoldi 2012). It follows a chronological processual organization.

4. The Case of a "Returnee" Entrepreneur in Turkey – from a Teenager to a Visionary Entrepreneur

This is a case of a Turkish diasporic family and its business. The migrant parents (later grandparents) were immigrant entrepreneurs and then returnee entrepreneurs that had a strong entrepreneurial orientation. The entrepreneur-establisher in this case, Mr. Kavkaci, does not fit in any theoretical category but overlaps many categories of migrantness and entrepreneurship. Thus, the presentation follows the development of migratory-entrepreneurial path and not rigid categories of any types (immigrant, ethnic vs. returnee entrepreneurship). The returnee dimension in this case is radically different (in terms of strategy and the individual entrepreneur's life path) from the idea of an adult investor-entrepreneur repatriating for venturing; moreover, it illustrates the possibility to stretch the limits of feasibility and contests the ideas behind the necessity-impediment view on entrepreneurship.

Entrepreneurial Activity and Economic Adaptation in Germany

As part of the large migrant wave from Turkey to Germany, the parents of Mr. Kavkaci left Turkey in 1961 and received "*Gastarbeiter*" status in Germany. They became labour diasporans, part of the largest German migrant-diaspora population (Bhagwati, Schatz, and Wong 1984; Klekowski von Koppenfels and Höhne 2017). The father of the entrepreneur worked in the mining sector.

The focal entrepreneur-to-be, Mr. Kavkaci, was born and grew up in Germany. He went to the local German school and managed to make it to a gymnasium, the advanced level of schooling in Germany, which required high grades to enter and was not typical at the time, especially for the children of migrants (Söhn and Özcan 2006). Thus, his education was built on the German school system, but his Turkish language skills originated from the family context, not from formal education nor the schooling system as this was unavailable at the time.

His mother took care of the family and children, but his father soon established a tailor shop for his wife. Two years later, they bought an Italian ice cream shop but realized that this business was not applicable for the winter season and turned the concept into a pizzeria. Soon after, they shifted the concept again to also include Turkish food, among the very first in Germany. This was a successful strategy and the business grew, leading them to open another restaurant in Düsseldorf. The entrepreneurial core group in their family business was the family the parents and the children who supported them.

Return to Turkey

In his teens, his parents decided to return to Turkey, their country of origin, and start a new life there. The two older brothers stayed in Germany as they already had settled down and had families of their own, but for Mr. Kavkaci there was no option to finish his education in Germany as he could not stay in the country without his parents. Despite their local social ties, the family, friends, and his Turkish family origin (Pruthi 2014), it was not easy to enter the education system in that phase as his education was from another country and his language skills were not on an adequate level. In Turkey, his school education (Gymnasium) was not accredited and he had to start all over from the fifth grade following classes with pupils of eleven and twelve years old – even though he was already 15. Thus, his prospects for higher education and local career building were not very realistic and counter to his plans. Instead of studying, he started working at a very young age and learned by doing. He worked in different tasks and helped in the café-restaurant of his parents during 1981-1983. During this time, he invested in improving his English at a language school for 18 months. Due to his language skills in German and English, he got a job at the biggest representative of foreign car spare parts in the automotive

aftermarket in 1985. In this business, he worked intensively and developed his capabilities and networks in the automotive sector and related services.

Becoming an Entrepreneur – Establishment of REKSIM

In 1992, he followed the entrepreneurial orientation (cf. Azmat 2013) of his family and established his first own venture called Reksim Ltd. Şti. He had one business partner working with him as the founding team coming from the same automotive business field (see Discua Cruz, Hamilton, and Jack 2012; Ruef 2010). They quickly managed to become representative agents for two German export houses, starting from international, or here, transnational business connecting Germany and Turkey (Alam et al. 2010; Dimitratos et al. 2016). In the meanwhile, Mr. Kavkaci had married his Turkish fiancée and established a family in Turkey, which cemented the business location in Turkey. His wife supported his ideas and could ensure stability in demanding entrepreneurial life through her expertise, education, and work in the pharmaceutical sector. Beyond the sparring partner effect, the external income of the entrepreneur-partners' working wives' formed a buffer against possible business failure and allowed them to bear the risks. Learning the automotive aftermarket business from the inside out, he was well aware of the local market, the market players, the respective processes, and the needs and prospects. He could also reflect on the vast potential of the growing Turkish market and its future development through the business contacts in Germany. His business model was built on his in-depth market knowledge where he could capitalize on his language and managerial capabilities acquired earlier and his German-international relations in the sector (Chesbrough 2007; Rana and Elo 2017). Mr. Kavkaci and his business partner facilitated initial growth by seeking further business with Germany, the country where many of the suppliers were located. The second year, they visited 15 potential business partners employing the transnational family resources of Mr. Kavkaci in Germany and were able to attract three new representations. The firm grew rapidly and represented approximately ten significant German automotive companies, leading businesses in the independent aftermarket, after only five years of venturing.

Introducing a Novel Strategy through a Turkish Alliance- New Entrepreneurial Group TATCOM

The Turkish market grew as he had estimated, but was also very competitive and structurally different from the German market. In the Turkish market, family firms and -groups were numerous and developing the automotive market. It did not have monopolies of state-owned multinational enterprises or such large dominant actors as in some emerging markets; instead, it had a plethora of smaller players and, more importantly, about 20 large players. Turkish business groups present some relational and structural similarities with Asian busi-

ness groups regarding family ownership and management (Guillen 2000). Emerging markets differ and Turkey had its particularities. Instead of centrally planned economy and state-actors shaping the rules of the game and the institutional environment (Kothari, Kotabe, and Murphy 2013; North 1991; Scott 2004), in this emerging entrepreneurial market it was families and business communities that were more central in making the market structures and relevant institutions (Estrin and Prevezer 2011; Hwang and Powell 2005). In comparison to state-owned firms, private, entrepreneurial firms may respond better to the demands of the customers because of their flexibility and in-depth knowledge of the market (Etemad 2015). The hard competition between these Turkish companies was created partly due to the fragmented, multi-actor structure that diminished their competitiveness, profitability, and negotiating power, for example, in front of large multinational suppliers (see Elo 2016a; Ghoshal and Bartlett 1990).

Mr. Kavkaci had a novel plan to overcome the structural problems of competition in the market. This plan was to include customers in the collaboration and create a "trilogy" by bringing together Reksim, its customers, and the suppliers introducing a collective strategy of a business group (Interview, 2018). This was novel and unique as no other such entrepreneurial group or alliance had been introduced earlier. The 20 large players were mainly family businesses. More than half of them had a business relationship with Reksim and were run by second-generation family members who were of similar age as Mr. Kavkaci. This created a common point for discussing the new plan. All of them were trying to outperform the other and were using resources for local level competition, competing on conditions: for example, payment terms, delivery terms, open credits, and some special actions done by them several times to gain necessary profit margins. Mr. Kavkaci started introducing his idea through his good relations with them, creating opportunities for them to get together and get to know each other. He organized meetings, business trips, and dinners. Slowly but consistently, he was able to convince them of the benefits of co-opetition (cf. Luo 2004). After initial trading attempts and trust creation, they decided on a common goal, competing together against the others with joint purchasing and common conditions generating higher turnover. As an end-effect of the co-opetitive alliance structure for their new business group, they had more organized purchasing and distribution of goods, as well as common actions to the market, i.e., the end user garages. Mr. Kavkaci noted that these common conditions were even better for the end users, thus this alliance was beneficial for everyone.

The new business group, a company called TATCOM, was founded in 2012 with nine shareholders. TATCOM is an aggregation of leading local family firms, where family-owned-and-run business groups represent the founding team (Basco and Pérez Rodríguez 2011; Discua Cruz, Hamilton, and Jack 2012). The key markets the new alliance served through its shareholders were

in spare parts services in passenger cars, light commercial vehicles, and heavy vehicles – sectors, similarly as before. Mr. Kavkaci serves as the chairman of the board at TATCOM group that leverages the entrepreneurial capability of its members strategically. He was selected indefinitely for this task. In parallel, Mr. Kavkaci is one of TATCOM's shareholders but remains also at Reksim as the founding entrepreneur and partner.

In shaping this strategy, he could compare the structures and strategies of the Turkish market and the German market. He has employed his immigrant effect capabilities (Chung, Rose, and Huang 2012) and strategically examined the structural challenges. His entrepreneurial strategy in this second venture embraced networking, cooperation, collaboration, and getting opportunities assessed together to consider the collaborative potential. His efforts in organizing social and business occasions and events, included also the families, resulting in important trust building and relationship development (Alam et al. 2010; Basco and Pérez Rodríguez 2011). Part of the problem in Turkey was endogenous; the local family business groups competiting with each other, while the German market has traditionally had a strong cooperative and coopetitive system in use and thus a strong Mittelstand and cooperation landscape (Vasilchenko and Morrish 2011; Merchant 2001; Child, Faulkner, and Tallman 2011[2]).

The Turkish partner firms, also successful as independent firms and business groups, could reflect on the positive potential of collaboration and co-opetition, similarly, as in the "Verbundgruppen" (von Hirschhausen, Neumann, and Weigt 2008; Zentes et al. 2012) that build strategic competitive advantages by horizontal cooperation. Such horizontal cooperation was unusual in Turkey and not part of the mainstream business culture (Eren-Erdogmus et al. 2010; Merchant 2001), which required particular effort to convince the partners.

The formation of TATCOM – both as an entrepreneurial group and a formal organizational structure of collaborating businesses – in Turkey was a major achievement where the leadership of the transnational entrepreneur in orchestrating the process together with other independent entrepreneurial groups (mostly Turkish family firms) was vital. The collaborative structure became an alliance, the first of its kind, to address the challenges of the Turkish automotive aftermarket sector and its supply systems. Since then, the company Tatcom is active as a Turkish Automotive Trade Community (Company presentation, 2017). The collectiveness here is not just cultural, but organizational, forming and uniting multiple family businesses entrepreneurially into a business network and -group. Furthermore, this network connects market players horizontally and vertically;

[2] See also <https://www.dgrv.de/webde.nsf/.../$FILE/Cooperatives EU.pdf> (Accessed January 28, 2018)

> Tatcom, as an active player of the automotive industry creates a network of manufacturers competitive in terms of quality and price to generate alternate options in the spare parts industry. (TATCOM website, 2018)

Participation in a Global Group – TATCOM with TEMOT INTERNATIONAL

As a kind of a transnational returnee-diaspora entrepreneur (Riddle, Hrivnak, and Nielsen 2010; Riddle and Brinkerhoff 2011), Mr. Kavkaci had his regular social contacts with his family members in Germany. Moreover, being educated in Germany and fluent in German, he was in the position to follow closely the developments, business strategies, and patterns as well as soft signals from the German market employing this "immigrant effect". Additionally, these capabilities were particularly useful in understanding the strategies of the large and quite dominant German and European suppliers and partners in the business sector. After the establishment of TATCOM, several supplier companies and international trading groups (ITGs[3]) began to put pressure on TATCOM members and Reksim to enter as a member of a buying group. Various negotiations took place, also with Mr. Kavkaci's German partners and contacts on the future strategy in terms of long term competitiveness and selecting right group partners for collaboration.

Guided by transnational connections and networks, TATCOM and TEMOT INTERNATIONAL – a global group of companies and a business network – started negotiating. TATCOM became a member in this unique international organization and strategic alliance with a similar strategy benefitting suppliers, members, and customers. In this process, the transnational contacts of Mr. Kavkaci were fruitful; "ZF Trading assisted the marriage as they knew both sides" (Interview, Temot International CEO). This shows how the "immigrant effect" was also about transnational relationships as ZF Trading is one of the key German supplier partners. Partnering with TEMOT INTERNATIONAL, which is a global organization in automotive aftermarket, was a major step in strategic internationalization of the Turkish members, among others. Temot International is present in Europe, Asia, America, Africa, and Australia; it employs more than 35,000 people directly and produces total revenues over € 10 billion. The Turkish group participates among others in purchasing, IT and eCommerce activities. Furthermore, on the local level, TATCOM is also a

[3] In several industries and businesses, the consolidation and strategy processes have generated strong groups operating as business actors, consisting of independent smaller firms joining forces. International trading groups and buying groups are examples of such collaborative groups. Although they can consist of entrepreneurial companies. these groups are not conceptually identical to the entrepreneurial group concept in Ruef (2010) as they address the firm-level instead of the individual level of collaboration. The empirical phenomena, however, are closely related and intertwined.

member of Turkish Automotive Aftermarket Association (OSS). It is led by Riza Sahin, who is also a co-owner of one of the shareholders of TATCOM and a member of the board of TATCOM (it was previously called Aftermarket Development Association of Turkey, OYPG). Thus, the Turkish TATCOM group presents multiple layers of collaboration. Via OSS, TATCOM also contributes to the local level networking and the business development of its members, the family business groups (cf. Sydow et al. 2010).

As of 2017, the entrepreneurially constructed business group TATCOM involves over 1200 employees through its partnerships and has achieved a significant strategic position in the Turkish market contributing to its growth, development, and internationality, see Figure 1.

Figure 1: The Cooperation of the Turkish Entrepreneurial Group and the International Trading Group (Company Document, 2017)

As a result, TATCOM represents the key suppliers in its fields and provides a notable coverage of international brands in the Turkish market, increasing their competitiveness. These international suppliers are selected alliance partners for supply and include the top of the sector in terms of technology and quality (see Figure 2). Notably, many of them share the German context (as German multinational enterprises), just like Mr. Kavkaci and present transnational features in their operations and strategy.

Figure 2: International Supplier Partners of the Alliance (Company Document, 2017)

These developments and the strong entrepreneurial strategy on coopetition have created a considerable competitive advantage that benefit the Turkish automotive aftermarket and its customers. Such developments regarding entrepreneurial alliances and business groups are more typical in Germany and Central Europe, but in the Mediterranean countries such formations are yet less developed or have had ideological foundations (cf. IBB and Institut für Handel und Internationales Marketing 2003). Thus, the case presents an outlier business development-wise, and an interesting transfer of strategy (cf. immigrant effect) that has been successful and, at the same time, has strongly built on Turkish context and culture taking care of the interests of Turkish partners and customers.

5. Findings and Discussion

Theoretically, the case develops an intersection of viewpoints that assist in addressing migrant entrepreneurship and resulting entrepreneurial groups and alliances. The prior studies on business groups and business networks focus more on the firm as an actor and the respective inter-organizational features (e.g., Sydow et al. 2010), leaving the entrepreneurial agency, resources, and social ties with less attention, while entrepreneurial groups and teams have focused on individuals but not on their immigrant effect. The transnationalism and migrantness of the entrepreneur and the resulting immigrant effect has remained a black box in the analysis of business groups (cf. Lechner and Leyronas 2009). Migrant businesses, their strategies, and growth paths are not relevant only in ethnic enclaves or ethnic business sectors, but very much embedded in the global business (e.g., Riddle and Brinkerhoff 2011; Ammassari 2004). At the same time, the perspective of groups addressing social formations, such as teams, family members, and other partners in venturing and entrepreneurial development can be rewarding for advancing the understanding of collective migrant entrepreneurship and its analysis (Ruef 2010; Karaevli and Yurtoglu 2017). This study suggests that both viewpoints are intertwined,

just focusing on a different viewpoint and layer on analysis, which, if combined, may provide a rich and more holistic understanding of the entrepreneurial dynamics (cf. Anderson et al. 2002; Håkansson et al. 2009). The interconnected layers that are fruitful for improving theoretical lenses and understanding include: family and origin, founding/entrepreneurial team and co-developer partnerships, firm as an organization, entrepreneurial business groups, alliances, and finally, global business networks (cf. Etemad 2018; Elo et al 2018). This study contributes by linking these layers of groups.

Furthermore, this study contests extant views on the theoretical categories of migrant entrepreneurs (see Etemad 2018; Elo et al. 2018; Elo and Servais 2018) that seem to be inadequate in offering exhaustive and dynamic analytical categories for explaining internationalising and growth oriented migrant entrepreneurs and their venturing. The case provides a novel perspective to concepts such as returnee, diaspora return, and repatriation with an age angle. It illustrates an outlier case of a teenager whose parents are returnees but who himself is in fact an immigrant in his own country of citizenship and nationality – but who is also a transnational entrepreneur spanning country contexts (Bai, Holmström Lind, and Johanson 2016; Wright et al. 2008; Rana and Elo 2017; Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome 2013; Liu et al. 2010; Riddle, Hrivnak, and Nielsen 2010). There is no category in any of the extant theories that could incorporate the case of Mr. Kavkaci, which highlights a need for theorizing on contextual processes and life paths. Furthermore, adolescents and young people who do not have a strong foothold educationally in the new setting – but with entrepreneurial resources potentially counterbalancing their disadvantaged entry – have not been addressed despite calls for more positive and balanced research lenses (Stahl and Tung 2015). This is a particularly critical category to understand, for example, for refugee adolescents who have been detained from the normal path (Wauters and Lambrecht, 2008).

The conceptualization of the actors, actor types, and their layers poses a challenge. For instance, the conceptual discussion on return, repatriation and "returneeness" requires revisiting. What makes a returnee becomes a complicated question in a case like this, where the individual is a so called second-generation migrant-diasporan in Germany, but actually a 1.5 generation immigrant in his parents' country of origin, which – despite all – is his home country. The entrepreneur here is a bicultural hybrid, he is not fully transnational either, only partly if the framing of Portes et al. (2002) is employed. These hybrid, bicultural, and transnational features are of central importance in the entrepreneurial path benefitting business development and international activities of his entrepreneurship.

The scaling of these immigrant effect features on different group levels directs the attention to the network structures and management (cf. Brinkerhoff 2009). Ties of transnational entrepreneurs may be central and highly useful in explaining the socializing, utilization of immigrant effect, resource access, and

-building, but also strategy formation of migrant entrepreneurs and their business groups. These transnational resources, meta-level perceptions and knowledge, migrant resilience, and context-specific social ties illustrate novel managerial implications to be considered in business group management. Additionally, the case contests the rigid necessity-opportunity divide and the stance approaching only adults or formally high-skilled migrants as objects of analysis and of theoretical interest. Challenging the elite perspectives (e.g., Elo and Leinonen 2018), resilient and creative repatriates with various, even unusual, family histories may become valuable business actors in their fields of expertise by accessing other dimensions in communication, networks, structures, culture, and ideas than local entrepreneurs or experts.

In terms of analytical perspectives, the individual embedded in an extended transnational context extends the view beyond single entrepreneur-individuals. This case study and its development path proposes that both broader time- and relational context are needed for analysis, not just post-migration era, snapshot type of lenses, and solo-individuals as actors (Aharoni 2011). Contextually, the study provides an example of the business group potential in emerging markets (Guillen 2000), which is in line with the emerging market multinational- phenomenon and expands it to family firms (Kotabe and Kothari 2016). The need of contextualization in analysis of such embedded processes over time and the contextualization of the diffusion of entrepreneurial strategies being linked to immigrant effect are explicated (cf. Welter 2011; Chung, Rose, and Huang 2012).

6. Limitations and Contributions

The greatest limitation of this study is also its strength: a single case study that has idiographic characteristics and is limited to specific spatio-temporal context. Potential for generalisation is limited, but at the same time, the approach offers an in-depth perspective on the complex interwovenness of individual migratory path, venturing, and transnational collaboration across business groups and alliances. Future research is needed to examine the role of migrants' age and origin dynamics linked to their entrepreneurial expectations and plans, as we know that adolescents face numerous problems in coping with migration experiences but are already having life plans and novel ideas (Petersen, Dunnbier, and Morgenroth 2012; Schimmer and Van Tubergen 2014). Moreover, the special transnational capabilities of migrants in employing their immigrant effect for developing local and international business, for recruiting members of entrepreneurial groups, entrepreneurial and business alliances, and for international business networking require further research attention.

Theoretical findings of the study contribute to multiple research streams. First, returnee migrants are addressed so far only as adults in research on re-

turnee entrepreneurship. The development of a teenager "returnee-migrant" and his resource employment as an entrepreneur provides insights on a rather unique growth path into becoming part of an international-global business group. Furthermore, the findings illustrate the embedded actor contexts around the individual entrepreneur and interconnect discussions on various entrepreneurial groups between social formations, business network formations and alliances. It presents the actors' multi-layeredness and intertwined development of the different types of groups (cf. Etemad 2018). This has inter-organizational and entrepreneurial strategy implications, adding to the complexity of management. The role of the founding team, the families around, and later the co-opetition and alliance building of several family groups play a central role in shaping this success story shifting the focus to the larger case of entrepreneurship (see Thomas 2011, see also Ford 2002; Ruef 2010; Larimo et al. 2015). In terms of family firms and strategy, family business growth in Turkey has been influenced by the heterogeneity from the founding family structures and in particular, by family size (Karaevli and Yurtoglu 2017). This case illustrates that in addition to heterogeneous capabilities and resources of the family, the family's entrepreneurial orientations, traditions, and behavioural schemata (cf. Azamt 2013), as well as the transnational diaspora ties influence business survival and growth (see e.g., Etemad 2004, 2018; Discua Cruz, Hamilton, and Jack 2012; Basco 2014; Basco and Pérez Rodríguez 2011; Riddle and Brinkerhoff 2011).

Concerning strategic implications, the findings underscore the transnational immigrant effect and suggest that the developed co-opetition strategy within the "trilogy" has been a well-functioning strategy transfer in the Turkish context (cf. Luo, 2004). Cooperation is one of the strategic backbones of the German Mittelstand, but similar entrepreneurial strategies are applicable in an emerging market context increasing the competitiveness of the family groups. In this case, cooperation worked through the global group formation (cf. ITGs) fostering their position in the international arena (cf. Guillen, 2000). Entrepreneurially, this implies that entrepreneurial families can successfully exploit and develop opportunities emerging from transnational contexts and increase their market position, particularly when they combine forces to face structures that could otherwise use dependencies against their interests (Luo 2004; Håkansson et al.2009). This is potentially a trait that stems from the transnational diaspora experience offering a "meta-view" on the markets.

Second, the findings expand the views beyond necessity and ethnic entrepreneurship related strategies illustrating an exceptional development and growth path (cf. Achidi et al., 2011; Basu, 2009; Chaganti et al., 2002). The findings imply that these categories are not rigid but change over time, as strategies evolve. How opportunities, constraints, and resources are employed on long-term is shaped by the larger understanding of the entrepreneurial teams that provided access to additional transnational and dynamic knowledge. In

short, diaspora matters as diasporic experiences, networks, resources, and ideas affect entrepreneurship, e.g., enable the development and transfer of immigrant effect and transnational constellations (Chung, Rose, and Huang 2012).

Concerning policymaking, there are numerous implications for the mobility of entrepreneurial families and family members. Transnational advantages require supportive policy settings; otherwise, there is a danger that they will remain unexploited, increasing brain waste. The migratory path of the entrepreneur shows how policymaking was not up-to-date to tackle the school accreditation and related challenges of the 1.5 and second generation mobility between the country of origin and the country of residence. Since then, several changes regarding transnational diaspora have been made in both settings. Inclusive and more holistic understanding could serve transnational policies. Policies need foresight and fast reaction to amend such discrepancies in the education acknowledgement and related mobility issues because they form unnecessary bottlenecks for talented and motivated immigrants, especially "returnees" who need linguistic support (Song 2011).

References

Achidi Ndofor, Hermann, and Richard L. Priem. 2011. Immigrant Entrepreneurs, the Ethnic Enclave Strategy, and Venture Performance. *Journal of Management* 37 (3): 790-818.

Aharoni, Yair. 2011. Fifty years of case research in international business: the power of outliers and black swans. In *Rethinking the Case Study in International Business and Management Research*, ed. Piekkari, R. and Welch, C. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Alam, Ian, Julien Cayla, Giana M Eckhardt, Tanja Kontinen, Arto Ojala, Constantine Andriopoulos, Stephanie Slater, et al. 2010. Internationalization of Emerging Market Firms: The Case of Turkish Retailers. *International Marketing Review* 27 (3): 316-37.

Aliaga-Isla, Rocío, and Alex Rialp. 2013. Systematic Review of Immigrant Entrepreneurship Literature: Previous Findings and Ways Forward. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 25 (9-10): 819-44.

Ardichvili, Alexander, Richard Cardozo, Souray Ray, and Ray S. 2003. A Theory of Entrepreneurial Opportunity Identification and Development. *Journal of Business Venturing* 18 (1): 105-23.

Azmat, Fara. 2013. Opportunities or obstacles? Understanding the challenges faced by migrant women entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship* 5 (2): 198-215.

Bai, Wensong, Christine Holmström Lind, and Martin Johanson. 2016. The Performance of International Returnee Ventures: The Role of Networking Capability and the Usefulness of International Business Knowledge. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 28 (9-10): 657-80.

Bai, Wensong, Holmström-Lind, Christine, and Martin Johanson. 2018. Leveraging networks, capabilities and opportunities for international success: A study on

returnee entrepreneurial ventures. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 34 (1): 51-62.
Basco, Rodrigo. 2014. Exploring the Influence of the Family upon Firm Performance: Does Strategic Behaviour Matter? *International Small Business Journal* 32 (8): 967-95.
Basco, Rodrigo, and María José Pérez Rodríguez. 2011. Ideal Types of Family Business Management: Horizontal Fit between Family and Business Decisions and the Relationship with Family Business Performance. *Journal of Family Business Strategy* 2 (3): 151-65.
Basu, Anuradha. 2009. Ethnic Minority Entrepreneurship. In *The Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship*, ed. Anuradha Basu, Casson Mark, Nigel Wadeson and Bernard Yeung. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Basu, Anuradha, and Meghna Virick. 2015. Silicon Valley's Indian Diaspora: Networking and Entrepreneurial Success. *South Asian Journal of Global Business Research* 4 (2): 190-208.
Beckers, Pascal, and Boris F. Blumberg. 2013. Immigrant Entrepreneurship on the Move: A Longitudinal Analysis of First- and Second-Generation Immigrant Entrepreneurship in the Netherlands. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 25 (7-8): 654-91.
Bengtsson, Maria, and Sören Kock. 2000. "Coopetition" in Business Networks – to Cooperate and Compete Simultaneously. *Industrial Marketing Management* 29 (5): 411-26.
Bhagwati, Jagdish N., Klaus Werner Schatz, and Kar yiu Wong. 1984. The West German Gastarbeiter System of Immigration. *European Economic Review* 26 (3): 277-94.
Blume-Kohout, Margaret E. 2016. Why Are Some Foreign-Born Workers More Entrepreneurial than Others? *Journal of Technology Transfer* 41 (6): 1327-53.
Brinkerhoff, Jennifer M., 2009. *Digital diasporas: Identity and transnational engagement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Brinkerhoff, Jennifer M., ed. 2016. Defining Entrepreneurs and Exploring Diaspora Applications. In *Institutional Reform and Diaspora Entrepreneurs : The In-Between Advantage,* 1-38. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Bruni, Attila, Silvia Gherardi, and Barbara Poggio. 2004. Doing Gender, Doing Entrepreneurship: An Ethnographic Account of Intertwined Practices. *Gender, Work and Organization* 11 (4): 406-29.
Bruton, Garry D., David Ahlstrom, and Krzysztof Obloj. 2008. Entrepreneurship in emerging economies: Where are we today and where should the research go in the future. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 32 (1): 1-14.
Castles, Stephen. 2010. Understanding Global Migration: A Social Transformation Perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36 (10): 1565-86.
Chaganti, Radba, and Patricia G. Greene. 2002. Who Are Ethnic Entrepreneurs? A Study of Entrepreneursapos; Ethnic Involvement and Business Characteristics. *Journal of Small Business Management* 40 (2): 126-43.
Chang, Cheng-Wen, David M. Chiang, and Fan-Yun Pai. 2012. Cooperative Strategy in Supply Chain Networks. *Industrial Marketing Management* 41 (7): 1114-24.
Chen, Wenhong, and Justin Tan. 2009. Understanding Transnational Entrepreneurship through a Network Lens: Theoretical and Methodological Considerations. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 33 (5): 1079-91.

Chesbrough, Henry. 2007. Business Model Innovation: It's Not Just about Technology Anymore. *Strategy & Leadership* 35 (6): 12-7.
Child, John, David Faulkner, and Stephen Tallman. 2011. *Cooperative Strategy: Managing Alliances, Networks, and Joint Ventures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Chrysostome, Elie. 2010. The Success Factors of Necessity Immigrant Entrepreneurs: In Search of a Model. *Thunderbird International Business Review* 52 (2): 137-52.
Chung, Henry F.L., Ellen Rose, and Pei how Huang. 2012. Linking International Adaptation Strategy, Immigrant Effect, and Performance: The Case of Home-Host and Cross-Market Scenario. *International Business Review* 21 (1): 40-58.
Clydesdale, Greg. 2008. Business Immigrants and the Entrepreneurial Nexus. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship* 6 (3): 123-42.
Cohen, Robin. 2008. *Global diasporas: An introduction*. London: Routledge.
Committee, Social Affairs, Migrant Entrepreneurship, In OECD, Its Contribution To, Employment Creation, and Of Immigrants. 2010. *Migrant Entrepreneurship in Oecd Countries and Its Contribution To Employment*. *Labour*.
Cooney, Thomas M. 2005. Editorial: What Is an Entrepreneurial Team? *International Small Business Journal* 23 (3): 226-35.
Coviello, N. 2006. The Network Dynamics of International New Ventures. *Journal of International Business Studies* 37 (5): 713-31.
Dana, Leo Paul. 2007. A Comparison of Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Enterprise in the Canadian Sub-Arctic. *International Journal of Business Performance Management* 9 (3): 278.
Dana, Leo Paul, and Teresa E. Dana. 2008. Ethnicity and Entrepreneurship in Morocco: A Photo-Ethnographic Study. *International Journal of Business and Globalisation* 2 (3): 209-26.
Denzin, Norman K. 2012. Triangulation 2.0. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 6 (2): 80-8.
Dimitratos, Pavlos, Trevor Buck, Margaret Fletcher, and Nicolas Li. 2016. The Motivation of International Entrepreneurship: The Case of Chinese Transnational Entrepreneurs. *International Business Review* 25 (5): 1103-13.
Discua Cruz, Allan, Eleanor Hamilton, and Sarah L. Jack. 2012. Understanding Entrepreneurial Cultures in Family Businesses: A Study of Family Entrepreneurial Teams in Honduras. *Journal of Family Business Strategy* 3 (3): 147-61.
Discua Cruz, Allan, Carole Howorth, and Eleanor Hamilton. 2013. Intrafamily Entrepreneurship: The Formation and Membership of Family Entrepreneurial Teams. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 37 (1): 17-46.
Drori, Israel, Benson Honig, and Ari Ginsberg. 2010. Transnational and Immigrant Entrepreneurship in a Globalized World. *University of Toronto Press*, April 2016, 211.
Drori, Israel, Benson Honig, and Mike Wright. 2009. Transnational Entrepreneurship: An Emergent Field of Study. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 33 (5): 1001-22.
Eisenhardt, Kathleen M. 1989. Building Theories from Case Study Research. *Academy of Management Review* 14 (4): 532-50.
Elo, Maria. 2016a. Can a Start-up Establish International Industry Standards? The International Development of a Data Solution Platform in Car Parts Business. *International Journal of Foresight and Innovation Policy* 11 (4): 256-75.

Elo, Maria. 2016b. Typology of Diaspora Entrepreneurship: Case Studies in Uzbekistan. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship* 14 (1): 121-55.
Elo, Maria. 2016c. Against All Odds – A Diaspora Entrepreneur Developing Russian and Central Asian Markets. In *The Challenge of BRIC Multinationals*, *Progress in International Business Research*, ed. Rob van Tulder, Alain Verbeke, Jorge Carneiro and Maria Alejandra Gonzalez-Perez, vol.11, 481-502.
Elo, Maria, Aki Harima, and Jörg Freiling. 2015. *To Try or Not to Try a Story of Diaspora Entrepreneurship*. In *The Future of Global Organizing, Progress in International Business Research*, ed. Rob van Tulder, Alain Verbeke and Rian Drogendijk, vol. 10, 283-93.
Elo, Maria, and Hanneleena Hieta. 2017. From Ethnic Enclaves to Transnational Entrepreneurs: The American Dream of the Finns in Oregon, USA. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 31 (2): 204-26.
Elo, Maria, and Päivi Jokela. 2015. Transnational Entrepreneurship among Bukharian Jewish Diaspora in Israel. *American Journal of Entrepreneurship* 8 (2): 22-42.
Elo, Maria, and Johanna Leinonen. 2018. Dynamics of diasporic life- entry and exit behaviour of highly skilled migrants. In *Global Mobility of Highly Skilled People*, ed. Driss Habti and Maria Elo. Heidelberg: Springer.
Elo, Maria, and Indianna Minto-Coy, eds. 2018. *Diaspora Networks in International Business: Perspectives for Understanding and Managing Diaspora Business and Resources.* Springer.
Elo, Maria, Susanne Sandberg, Per Servais, Rodrigo Basco, Allan D. Cruz, Liesl Riddle, and Florian Täube. 2018. Advancing the views on migrant and diaspora entrepreneurs in international entrepreneurship. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship* 16 (2): 1-15.
Elo, Maria, and Per Servais. 2018. Migration perspective on entrepreneurship. In *Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Entrepreneurship*, ed. Romeo V. Turcan and Norman M. Fraser, 355-86. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
Elo, Maria, and Sivaram Vemuri. 2016. Organizing Mobility: A Case Study of Bukharian Jewish Diaspora. *Diaspora Studies* 9 (2): 179-93.
Elo, Maria, and Erez K. Volovelsky. 2017. Jewish Diaspora Entrepreneurs – The Impact of Religion on Opportunity Exploration and Exploitation. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 31 (2): 244-69.
Eren-Erdogmus, Irem, Emine Cobanoglu, Muge Yalcin, and Pervez N. Ghauri. 2010. Internationalization of Emerging Market Firms: The Case of Turkish Retailers. *International Marketing Review* 27 (3): 316-37.
Estrin, Saul, and Martha Prevezer. 2011. The Role of Informal Institutions in Corporate Governance: Brazil, Russia, India, and China Compared. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* 28 (1): 41-67.
Etemad, Hamid. 2004. International entrepreneurship as a dynamic adaptive system: towards a grounded theory. *Journal of international entrepreneurship* 2 (1-2): 5-59.
Etemad, Hamid. 2015. Entrepreneurial Orientation-Performance Relationship in the International Context. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship* 13 (1): 1-6.
Etemad, Hamid. 2018. Advances and challenges in the evolving field of international entrepreneurship: The case of migrant and diaspora entrepreneurs. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship* 16 (2): 109-118.
Filatotchev, Igor, Xiaohui Liu, Trevor Buck, and Mike Wright. 2009. The export orientation and export performance of high-technology SMEs in emerging markets:

The effects of knowledge transfer by returnee entrepreneurs. *Journal of International Business Studies* 40 (6): 1005-21.
Gartner, William B. 1989. 'Who Is an Entrepreneur?' is the Wrong Question. *American Journal of Small Business* 12 (4): 11-32.
Gaur, Ajai S., and Vikas Kumar. 2010. Internationalization of Emerging Market Firms: A Case for Theoretical Extension. In *Advances in International Management* 23: 603-27.
Ghoshal, Sumantra, and Christopher A. Bartlett. 1990. The Multinational Corporation as an Interorganizational Network. *Academy of Management Review* 15 (4): 603-26.
Gillespie, Kate, Liesl Riddle, Edward Sayre, and David Sturges. 1999. Diaspora Interest in Homeland Investment. *Journal of International Business Studies* 30 (3): 623-34.
Granovetter, Mark. 1985. The Problem of Embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology American Journal of Sociology This* 91 (3): 481-510.
Guarnizo, Luis Eduardo, Alejandro Portes, and William Haller. 2003. Assimilation and Transnationalism: Determinants of Transnational Political Action among Contemporary Migrants. *American Journal of Sociology* 108 (6): 1211-48.
Halinen, Aino, Jan-Åke Törnroos, and Maria Elo. 2013. Network Process Analysis: An Event-Based Approach to Study Business Network Dynamics. *Industrial Marketing Management* 42 (8): 1213-22.
Halinen, Aino, and Jan- Åke Törnroos. 2005. Using Case Methods in the Study of Contemporary Business Networks. *Journal of Business Research* 58 (9 SPEC. ISS.): 1285-97.
Halinen, Aino, and Jan-Åke Törnroos. 1998. The Role of Embeddedness in the Evolution of Business Networks. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 14 (3): 187-205.
Harima, Aino, Maria Elo, and Jörg Freiling. 2016. Rich-to-Poor Diaspora Ventures: How Do They Survive? *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 28 (4): 391-413.
Harper, David A. 2008. Towards a theory of entrepreneurial teams. *Journal of Business Venturing* 23 (6): 613-26.
Heath, Linda. 2015. Triangulation: Methodology. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 639-44.
Hwang, Hokyu, and Walter W. Powell. 2005. Institutions and Entrepreneurship. *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research*, 179-210. Boston: Springer.
Håkansson, Håkan, David Ford, Lars-Erik Gadde, Ivan Snehota, and Alexandra Waluszewski. 2009. *Business in networks*. Chichester: A John Wiley and Sons Ltd Publication.
Iacobucci, Donato, and Peter Rosa. 2005. Growth, Diversification, and Business Group Formation in Entrepreneurial Firms. *Small Business Economics* 25 (1): 65-82.
Ibeh, Kevin, and Laila Kasem. 2011. The Network Perspective and the Internationalization of Small and Medium Sized Software Firms from Syria. *Industrial Marketing Management* 40 (3): 358-67.
Ilhan-Nas, Tulay, Kader Sahin, and Zuhal Cilingir. 2011. International Ethnic Entrepreneurship: Antecedents, Outcomes and Environmental Context. *International Business Review* 20 (6): 614-26.

Johnson, Cathryn, Timothy J. Dowd, and Cecilia L. Ridgeway. 2006. Legitimacy as a Social Process. *Annual Review of Sociology* 32 (1): 53-78.
Johnstone, Bruce A. 2007. Ethnographic Methods in Entrepreneurship Research. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods in Entrepreneurship*, 97-121.
Jones, Marian V, and Nicole E Coviello. 2005. Internationalisation: Conceptualising an Entrepreneurial Process of Behaviour in Time. *Journal of International Business Studies* 36 (3): 284-303.
Jones, Trevor, Monder Ram, Paul Edwards, Alex Kiselinchev, and Lovemore Muchenje. 2014. Mixed Embeddedness and New Migrant Enterprise in the UK. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 26 (5-6): 500-20.
Kakarika, Maria. 2013. Staffing an Entrepreneurial Team: Diversity Breeds Success. *Journal of Business Strategy* 34 (4): 31-8.
Karaevli, Ayse, and B. Burcin Yurtoglu. 2017. Founding Family Effects on Business Group Growth: Longitudinal Evidence from Turkey (1925-2012). *Long Range Planning*, in press.
Kenney, Martin, Dan Breznitz, and Michael Murphree. 2013. Coming back home after the sun rises: Returnee entrepreneurs and growth of high tech industries. *Research Policy* 42 (2): 391-407.
Khanna, Tarun, and Krishna Palepu. 1999. The Right Way to Restructure Conglomerates in Emerging Markets. *Harvard Business Review* 77: 125-35.
Klekowski von Koppenfels, Amanda, and Jutta Höhne. 2017. Gastarbeiter Migration Revisited : Consolidating Germany's Position as an Immigration Country. *IMISCOE Research Series*, 149-74.
Kloosterman, Robert C. 2010. Matching Opportunities with Resources: A Framework for Analysing (Migrant) Entrepreneurship from a Mixed Embeddedness Perspective. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 22 (1): 25-45.
Kontos, Maria. 2003. Self-employment policies and migrants' entrepreneurship in Germany. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 15 (2): 119-35.
Kotabe, Masaaki, and Tanvi Kothari. 2016. Emerging Market Multinational Companies' Evolutionary Paths to Building a Competitive Advantage from Emerging Markets to Developed Countries. *Journal of World Business* 51 (5): 729-43.
Kothari, Tanvi, Masaaki Kotabe, and Priscilla Murphy. 2013. Rules of the Game for Emerging Market Multinational Companies from China and India. *Journal of International Management* 19 (3): 276-99.
Kumar, Vikas, Ram Mudambi, and Sid Gray. 2013. Internationalization, Innovation and Institutions: The 3 I's Underpinning the Competitiveness of Emerging Market Firms. *Journal of International Management* 19 (3): 203-6.
Kuznetsov, Yevgeny, ed. 2006a. *Diaspora Networks and the International Migration of Skills*. Washington DC: The World Bank.
Kuznetsov, Yevgeny, ed. 2006b. Leveraging diasporas of talent: toward a new policy agenda. In *Diaspora Networks and the International Migration of Skills,* 221-37. Washington DC: The World Bank.
Landolt, Patricia. 2001. Salvadoran Economic Transnationalism: Embedded Strategies for Household Maintenance, Immigrant Incorporation, and Entrepreneurial Expansion. *Global Networks* 1 (3): 217-42.

Lechner, Christian, and Christophe Leyronas. 2009. Small-Business Group Formation as an Entrepreneurial Development Model. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 33 (3): 645-67.

Liu, Xiaohui, Jiangyong Lu, Igor Filatotchev, Trevor Buck, and Mike Wright. 2010. Returnee Entrepreneurs, Knowledge Spillovers and Innovation in High-Tech Firms in Emerging Economies. *Journal of International Business Studies* 41 (7): 1183-97.

Ma, Zhenzhong, Shuzhen Zhao, Tangting Wang, and Yender Lee. 2013. An Overview of Contemporary Ethnic Entrepreneurship Studies: Themes and Relationships. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research* 19 (1): 32-52.

Mainela, Tuija, Vesa Puhakka, and Per Servais. 2014. The Concept of International Opportunity in International Entrepreneurship: A Review and a Research Agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 16 (1): 105-29.

Marschan-Piekkari, Rebecca, and Catherine Welch, eds. 2004. *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for International Business*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Masurel, Enno, Peter Nijkamp, Murat Tastan, and Gabriella Vindigni. 2002. Motivations and Performance Conditions for Ethnic Entrepreneurship. *Growth and Change* 33 (2): 238-60.

McCormick, Barry, and Jackline Wahba. 2001. Overseas Work Experience, Savings and Entrepreneurship Amongst Return Migrants to LDCs. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* 48 (2): 164-78.

Merchant, Hemant. 2001. Cooperative Strategy: Economic, Business, and Organizational Issues. *Academy of Management Review* 26 (2): 316-8.

Newland, Kathleen, and Hiroyuki Tanaka. 2010. *Mobilizing Diaspora Entrepreneurship for Development.* Washington DC: Migration Policy Insitute, October 35.

Nijkamp, Peter, Mediha Sahin, and Tüzin Baycan-levent. 2010. Migrant Entrepreneurship and New Urban Economic Opportunities: Identification of Critical Success Factors by Means of Qualitative Pattern Recognition Analysis. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie* 101 (4): 371-91.

Nkongolo-Bakenda, Jean-Marie, and Elie Virgile Chrysostome. 2013. Engaging Diasporas as International Entrepreneurs in Developing Countries: In Search of Determinants. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship* 11 (1): 30-64.

North, Douglass C. 1991. Institutions. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 5 (1): 97-112.

Oviatt, Benjamin M., and Patricia P. McDougall. 2005. Defining International Entrepreneurship and Modeling the Speed of Internationalization. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 29 (5): 537-54.

Petersen, Lars-Eric, Ulrike Dunnbier, and Olaf Morgenroth. 2012. Ethnic Identity and Ethnicity-Related Stress in Accompanied and Unaccompanied Adolescent Immigrants: Does the Family Work as Social Capital for Adolescent immigrants? (Report). *Psychology (Irvine)* 3 (4): 370-7.

Piekkari, Rebecca, Emmanuella Plakoyiannaki, and Catherine Welch. 2010. 'Good' Case Research in Industrial Marketing: Insights from Research Practice. *Industrial Marketing Management* 39 (1): 109-17.

Portes, Alejandro. 2006. Conclusion: Theoretical Convergencies and Empirical Evidence in the Study of Immigrant Transnationalism. *International Migration Review* 37 (3): 874-92.
Portes, Alejandro, Luis Eduardo Guarnizo, and William J. Haller. 2002. Transnational Entrepreneurs: An Alternative Form of Immigrant Economic Adaptation. *American Sociological Review* 67 (2): 278-98.
Price, Marie, and Elizabeth Chacko. 2009. The Mixed Embeddedness of Ethnic Entrepreneurs in a New Immigrant Gateway. *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies* 7 (3): 328-46.
Pruthi, Sarika. 2014. Social Ties and Venture Creation by Returnee Entrepreneurs. *International Business Review* 23 (6): 1139-52.
Ram, Monder, and Trevor Jones. 2008. Ethnic-Minority Businesses in the UK: A Review of Research and Policy Developments. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 26 (2): 352-74.
Ram, Monder, Nicholas Theodorakopoulos, and Trevor Jones. 2008. Forms of Capital, Mixed Embeddedness and Somali Enterprise. *Work, Employment and Society* 22 (3): 427-46.
Rana, Mohammad B., and Maria Elo. 2017. Transnational Diaspora and Civil Society Actors Driving MNE Internationalisation: The Case of Grameenphone in Bangladesh. *Journal of International Management* 23 (1): 87-106.
Rath, Jan, and Robert Kloosterman. 2000. Outsiders' Business: A Critical Review of Research on Immigrant Entrepreneurship. *International Migration Review* 34 (3): 657-81.
Reiche, B. Sebastian. 2012. Knowledge Benefits of Social Capital upon Repatriation: A Longitudinal Study of International Assignees. *Journal of Management Studies* 49 (6): 1052-77.
Riddle, Liesl, and Jennifer Brinkerhoff. 2011. Diaspora Entrepreneurs as Institutional Change Agents: The Case of Thamel.com. *International Business Review* 20 (6): 670-80.
Riddle, Liesl, George A. Hrivnak, and Tjai M. Nielsen. 2010. Transnational Diaspora Entrepreneurship in Emerging Markets: Bridging Institutional Divides. *Journal of International Management* 16 (4): 398-411.
Ruef, Martin. *The Entrepreneurial Group: Social Identities, Relations, and Collective Action*. Princeton University Press, 2010.
Sahin, Nesrin Hisli. 1990. Re-Entry and the Academic and Asychological Problems of the Second Generation. *Psychology & Developing Societies* 2 (2): 165-82.
Santamaria-Alvarez, Sandra, Milena, Muñoz-Castro, Diana Carolina, Sarmiento-González, Maria Angélica, and Sara Isabel Marín-Zapata. 2018. Fragmented networks and transnational entrepreneurship: Building strategies to prosper in challenging surroundings. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship* 16 (2): 244-75.
Sarason, Yolanda, Tom Dean, and Jesse F. Dillard. 2006. Entrepreneurship as the Nexus of Individual and Opportunity: A Structuration View. *Journal of Business Venturing* 21 (3): 286-305.
Schimmer, Paulien, and Frank Van Tubergen. 2014. Transnationalism and Ethnic Identification among Adolescent Children of Immigrants in the Netherlands, Germany, England, and Sweden. *International Migration Review* 48 (3): 680-709.
Scott, W. Richard. 2004. Institutional Theory: Contributing to a Theoretical Research Program. *Great Minds in Management The Process of Theory Development*, 460-84.

Shane, Scott, and Sankaran Venkataraman. 2007. The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research. In *Entrepreneurship*, 171-84. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.
Silverman, David. 1998. Qualitative Research: Meanings or Practices? *Information Systems Journal* 8 (1): 3-20.
Silverman, David. 2006. *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction*. *Sage Publications*.
Sinkovics, Rudolf R., and Eva A. Alfoldi. 2012. Progressive Focusing and Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research. *Management International Review* 52 (6): 817-45.
Song, Steve. 2011. Second-Generation Turkish Youth in Europe: Explaining the Academic Disadvantage in Austria, Germany, and Switzerland. *Economics of Education Review* 30 (5): 938-49.
Sui, Sui, Horatio M. Morgan, and Matthias Baum. 2015. Internationalization of Immigrant-Owned SMEs: The Role of Language. *Journal of World Business* 50 (4): 804-14.
Stahl, Günter K, and Rosalie L. Tung. 2015. Towards a more balanced treatment of culture in international business studies: The need for positive cross-cultural scholarship. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 46 (4): 391-414.
Sydow, Jörg, Arnold Windeler, Carsten Wirth, and Udo Staber. 2010. Foreign market entry as network entry: A relational-structuration perspective on internationalization in television content production. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 26 (1): 13-24.
Söhn, Janina, and Veysel Özcan. 2006. The Educational Attainment of Turkish Migrants in Germany. *Turkish Studies* 7 (1): 101-24.
Sørensen, Ninna Nyberg, and Ida Marie Vammen. 2014. Who Cares? Transnational Families in Debates on Migration and Development. *New Diversities* 16 (2): 89-108.
"Tatcom – Tatcom. " Homepage. <http://tatcom.com.tr/en/anasayfaen/> (Accessed multiple times between 2016-2018).
Terjesen, Siri, and Amanda Elam. 2009. Transnational Entrepreneurs' Venture Internationalization Strategies: A Practice Theory Approach. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 33 (5): 1093-120.
Tharenou, Phyllis. 2010. Identity and Global Mobility. In *The Psychology of Global Mobility,* 105-23.
Thomas, Gary, 2011. A typology for the case study in social science following a review of definition, discourse, and structure. *Qualitative inquiry* 17 (6): 511-21.
Urbano, David, Nuria Toledano, and Domingo Ribeiro-Soriano. 2011. Socio-Cultural Factors and Transnational Entrepreneurship: A Multiple Case Study in Spain. *International Small Business Journal* 29 (2): 119-34.
Van Dalen, Hendrik P., George Groenewold, and Tineke Fokkema. 2005. The Effect of Remittances on Emigration Intentions in Egypt, Morocco, and Turkey. *Population Studies* 59 (3): 375-92.
Vasilchenko, Elena, and Sussie Morrish. 2011. The Role of Entrepreneurial Networks in the Exploration and Exploitation of Internationalization Opportunities by Information and Communication Technology Firms. *Journal of International Marketing* 19 (4): 88-105.
Vissa, Balagopal, and Aya S. Chacar. 2009. Leveraging ties: the contingent value of entrepreneurial teams' external advice networks on Indian software venture performance. *Strategic Management Journal* 30 (11): 1179-91.

Volery, Thierry. 2007. Ethnic Entrepreneurship: A Theoretical Framework. In *Handbook Of Research On Ethnic Minority Entrepreneurship: A Co-Evolutionary View on Resource Management*, 30-41.

von Hirschhausen, Christian, Anne Neumann, and Hannes Weigt. 2008. Horizontale Entflechtung Als Instrument Einer Aktiven Wettbewerbspolitik. *Wirtschaftsdienst* 88 (5): 322-5.

Waldinger, Roger, Howard Aldrich, and Robin Ward. 1990. Ethnic Entrepreneurs: Immigrant Business in Industrial Societies. *Sage*.

Waldinger, Roger, and Lauren Duquette-rury. 2015. Emigrant Politics, Immigrant Engagement : Homeland Ties and Immigrant Political Identity in the United States. *The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 2 (3): 42-59.

Wauters, Bram, and Lambrecht, Johan. 2008. Barriers to refugee entrepreneurship in Belgium: Towards an explanatory model. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 34 (6): 895-915.

Welter, Friederike. 2011. Contextualizing Entrepreneurship-Conceptual Challenges and Ways Forward. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 35 (1): 165-84.

Wiklund, Johan, Per Davidsson, David B. Audretsch, and Charlie Karlsson. 2011. The Future of Entrepreneurship Research. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 35 (1): 1-9.

Wright, Mike, Xiaohui Liu, Trevor Buck, and Igor Filatotchev. 2008. Returnee Entrepreneurs, Science Park Location Choice and Performance: An Analysis of High-Technology SMEs in China. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 32 (1): 131-55.

Yeung, Henry. W.C. 1999. The internationalization of ethnic Chinese business firms from Southeast Asia: Strategies, processes and competitive advantage. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 23 (1): 88-102.

Yin, Robert K. 2013. Validity and generalization in future case study evaluations. *Evaluation* 19 (3): 321-32.

Zahra, Shaker A. 2008. The Virtuous Cycle of Discovery and Creation of Entrepreneurial Opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 2 (3): 243-57.

Zahra, Shaker A., Mike Wright, and Sondos G. Abdelgawad. 2014. Contextualization and the Advancement of Entrepreneurship Research. *International Small Business Journal* 32 (5): 479-500.

Zentes, Joachim, Bernhard Swoboda, Dirk Morschett, and Hanna Schramm-Klein. 2012. *Handbuch Handel: Strategien – Perspektiven – Internationaler Wettbewerb*. *Multi Channel Retailing – Erscheinungsformen Und Erfolgsfaktoren*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien.

Zolin, Roxanne, and Francine Schlosser. 2013. Characteristics of Immigrant Entrepreneurs and Their Involvement in International New Ventures. *Thunderbird International Business Review* 55 (3): 271-84.

Historical Social Research
Historische Sozialforschung

All articles published in HSR Special Issue 44 (2019) 4:
Entrepreneurial Groups & Entrepreneurial Families.

For further information on our journal, including tables of contents, article abstracts, and our extensive online archive, please visit https://www.gesis.org/en/hsr.